Prepared for Utah Department of Workforce Services, Office of Work and Family Life 140 East 300 South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
801-526-4340
http://jobs.utah.gov/occ/

Table of Contents	
Introduction Methodology Data	Page 4
Tables	
Table 1 Available Spaces, Vacancies, Child Population, Child Care Density 0 through 11 Months Old	Page 5
Table 2	
Available Spaces, Vacancies, Child Population, Child Care Density 12 Month through 23 Month Olds	Page 6
Table 3	
Available Spaces, Vacancies, Child Population, Child Care Density 2 Year Olds	Page 7
Table 4	
Available Spaces, Vacancies, Child Population, Child Care Density 3 Year Olds	Page 8
Table 5	
Available Spaces, Vacancies, Child Population, Child Care Density 4 and 5 Year Olds	Page 9
Table 6	
Available Spaces, Vacancies, Child Population, Child Care Density Kindergarten (6 Year Olds)	Page 10
Table 7	
Available Spaces, Vacancies, Child Population, Child Care Density 1 <sup>st</sup> through 6 <sup>th</sup> Grade (7 to 12 Year Olds)	Page 11
Table 8	
Child Population 13 to 17 Year Olds	Page 12
Table 9	
Child Care Resource and Referral (CCR&R) Agencies Serving Utah	Page 13
Table 10	D 14
Child Care Density Ratio 0 Through 11 Months Old	Page 14
Table 11 Child Care Density Ratio 12 Through 23 Months Old	Page 15
Child Care Density Rado 12 Through 23 Worlds Old	r age 13

Table 12 Child Care Density Ratio 2 Year Olds	Page 16
Table 13 Child Care Density Ratio 3 Year Olds	Page 17
Table 14 Child Care Density Ratio 4 and 5 Year Olds	Page 18
Table 15 Child Care Density Ratio Kindergarten	Page 19
Table 16 Child Care Density Ratio 1st Through 6th Grade	Page 20

#### Introduction

The Office of Work and Family Life (formerly the Office of Child Care) prepares a child care needs assessment at least once a year. It is a tool to assist staff and the community to determine where child care need is the greatest and where scarce resources need to be distributed.

This needs assessment reports on child care supply in each of Utah's twenty-nine counties. Child care demand or need is estimated based on child care density (CCD). The last needs assessment produced by the Office of Child Care was prepared March of 2005.

Utah's child care resource and referral (CCR&R) agencies are a source for information on child care needs. Customer surveys are given to parents receiving child care referrals through the CCR&Rs. The survey includes questions about child care need and the challenges to finding care.

#### Methodology

Needs assessment instruments vary from simple to complex. Some instruments include parent work patterns, where parents work, child care accessibility at the workplace or home, family income, and number of working parents-whether a single parent in the workforce or two-parent families with both parents employed. More complex instruments use birth data, county growth projections, and look at child care provider waiting lists.

The methodology used for this assessment is based on a model developed by Gwen Morgan, a child care systems expert from Wheelock College. Dr. Morgan recommends, "that a community should have about 25 spaces per every 100 children". This ratio of child care spaces to child population is called child care density. A child care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

#### Data

Child care providers listed with Utah's network of regional child care recourses and referral (CCR&R) agencies are used in this study. The CCR&Rs contracted by the Office of Work and Family Life, obtain initial information about child care providers from the Department of Health and the Office of Child Care Licensing. Each CCR&R surveys the community for all types of after school programs. Each CCR&R also augments provider data with rates, spaces and vacancies along with other information. Data are updated by the CCR&Rs at least twice a year. Inclusion on CCR&R databases is voluntary and some child care providers opt out.

Space and vacancy data are snapshots in time. Space and vacancy data may not accurately reflect child care supply and demand in a county. Spaces may be concentrated in one area of a county while the demand for care may be in another part of the county. Space and vacancy data are from FY 2006 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter reports (Oct-Dec 2005).

Child care spaces for the purposes of this study are available spaces. Available spaces are the number of spaces a regulated provider is actually willing to take, and could be different from what they may be licensed to take. For example, if a family provider is licensed for 8 children, but only wants to care for 6 children and won't take more than 6, then 6 is the reported available spaces.

The number of available spaces may often be less than the number of licensed spaces, but it will never be more than the number of licensed spaces. This may be a more reliable number to use when calculating the availability of child care or need for child care. If a regulated provider is unwilling to fill a certain number of spaces she/he is licensed for, then for all practical purposes those spaces are not available.

Vacancy information is provided to show space utilization. High vacancy percentages may indicate low demand or may be an indicator of the quality of care provided.

The child population data are 2005 projections provided by the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget. The projections are based on 2000 census data.

Child Care Density (CCD) is calculated using the number of regulated spaces per 100 children (all children). The child population represents children in the following age groups: 0 through 11 months, over 1 year but less than 2 years, 2 years, 3 years, 4 and 5 year, 6 years, and 7 to 12 years.

It is to be noted that smaller numbers tend to skew percentages.

TABLE 1 2006 Child Care Needs Assessment 0 Through 11 Months Old

		Spaces Vacant			Child
	Available Spaces	or Not Used			Care
	for	for	Percent	Child	Density
County	0 through 11	0 through 11	Spaces Vacant	Population	
	Months Old	Months Old	or Not Used	< 1 Year Old	2006
Beaver	14	0	0.0%	125	11
Box Elder	125	14	11.2%	778	16
Cache	235	48	20.4%	2,488	9
Carbon	43	7	16.3%	311	14
Daggett	0	0	0.0%	7	0
Davis	542	63	11.6%	5,744	9
Duchesne	38	8	21.1%	274	14
Emery	11	4	36.4%	158	7
Garfield	10	0	0.0%	67	15
Grand	17	6	35.3%	93	18
Iron	217	28	12.9%	846	26
Juab	35	2	5.7%	172	20
Kane	12	0	0.0%	71	17
Millard	31	7	22.6%	183	17
Morgan	16	4	25.0%	120	13
Piute	0	0	0.0%	18	0
Rich	2	1	50.0%	35	6
Salt Lake	1,626	337	20.7%	18,804	9
San Juan	26	1	3.8%	212	12
Sanpete	60	7	11.7%	401	15
Sevier	77	11	14.3%	342	23
Summit	76	6	7.9%	575	13
Tooele	49	4	8.2%	1,130	4
Uintah	39	5	12.8%	499	8
Utah	772	130	16.8%	11,640	7
Wasatch	51	6	11.8%	427	12
Washington	236	35	14.8%	2,500	9
Wayne	8	0	0.0%	36	22
Weber	490	65	13.3%	4,024	12
Totals	4,858	799		52,080	

<sup>\*</sup>Child Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

Available spaces are the number of spaces a regulated provider is actually willing to take.

 $\label{thm:maps} \mbox{Smaller numbers may skew percentages}.$ 

TABLE 2 2006 Child Care Needs Assessment 12 Through 23 Months Old

		Spaces Vacant		Child	Child Care
	Available Spaces			Population	Density
	for	for	Percent	< 1 Year Old and	Ratio*
County	12 through 23	12 through 23	Spaces Vacant	Less Than 2	ratio
County	Months Old	Months Old	or Not Used	Years Old	2006
Beaver	14	1	7.1%	63	22
Box Elder	131	16	12.2%	794	16
Cache	242	53	21.9%	2,425	10
Carbon	43	7	16.3%	295	15
Daggett	0	0	0.0%	11	0
Davis	573	85	14.8%	5,626	10
Duchesne	38	10	26.3%	297	13
Emery	12	4	33.3%	158	8
Garfield	10	0	0.0%	67	15
Grand	17	6	35.3%	100	17
Iron	219	29	13.2%	838	26
Juab	35	2	5.7%	171	20
Kane	12	4	33.3%	78	15
Millard	31	7	22.6%	188	16
Morgan	16	4	25.0%	123	13
Piute	0	0	0.0%	18	0
Rich	2	1	50.0%	34	6
Salt Lake	1,879	385	20.5%	18,789	10
San Juan	26	1	3.8%	205	13
Sanpete	65	7	10.8%	390	17
Sevier	78	11	14.1%	328	24
Summit	90	13	14.4%	580	16
Tooele	53	4	7.5%	1,116	5
Uintah	39	6	15.4%	499	8
Utah	822	136	16.5%	11,506	7
Wasatch	53	7	13.2%	422	13
Washington	237	40	16.9%	2,387	10
Wayne	8	0	0.0%	35	23
Weber	554	85	15.3%	4,052	14
Totals	5,299	924		51,595	

<sup>\*</sup>Child Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

Available spaces are the number of spaces a regulated provider is actually willing to take.

TABLE 3
2006 Child Care Needs Assessment
2 Year Olds

		Spaces Vacant			Child Care
	Available Spaces	or Not Used			Density
	for	for	Percent	Child	Ratio*
County	2 Year	2 year	Spaces Vacant	Population	
	Olds	Ölds	or Not Used	2 Year Olds	2006
Beaver	50	8	16.0%	130	38
Box Elder	526	73	13.9%	774	68
Cache	923	215	23.3%	2,448	38
Carbon	170	29	17.1%	325	52
Daggett	0	0	0.0%	5	0
Davis	2,111	359	17.0%	5,701	37
Duchesne	139	24	17.3%	265	52
Emery	71	20	28.2%	155	46
Garfield	40	0	0.0%	70	57
Grand	79	16	20.3%	91	87
Iron	593	133	22.4%	832	71
Juab	132	13	9.8%	170	78
Kane	42	12	28.6%	69	61
Millard	131	35	26.7%	180	73
Morgan	63	28	44.4%	120	53
Piute	0	0	0.0%	19	0
Rich	7	4	57.1%	36	19
Salt Lake	5,545	1,238	22.3%	18,489	30
San Juan	94	2	2.1%	214	44
Sanpete	268	55	20.5%	410	65
Sevier	341	85	24.9%	351	97
Summit	378	37	9.8%	571	66
Tooele	225	51	22.7%	1,104	20
Uintah	186	17	9.1%	500	37
Utah	3,987	745	18.7%	11,168	36
Wasatch	173	32	18.5%	419	41
Washington	1,026	205	20.0%	2,355	44
Wayne	27	0	0.0%	38	71
Weber	1,908	324	17.0%	4,007	48
Totals	19,235	3,760		51,016	

<sup>\*</sup>Child Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

Available spaces are the number of spaces a regulated provider is actually willing to take.

TABLE 4 2006 Child Care Needs Assessment 3 Year Olds

	Available Spaces	Spaces Vacant or Not Used			Child Care Density
	for	for	Percent	Child	Ratio*
County	3 Year	3 Year	Spaces Vacant	Population	
,	Olds	Olds	or Not Used	3 Years Old	2006
Beaver	50	8	16.0%	113	44
Box Elder	545	73	13.4%	793	69
Cache	985	231	23.5%	2,328	42
Carbon	170	29	17.1%	278	61
Daggett	0	0	0.0%	14	0
Davis	2,231	394	17.7%	5,427	41
Duchesne	139	27	19.4%	308	45
Emery	71	23	32.4%	154	46
Garfield	40	0	0.0%	64	63
Grand	79	16	20.3%	104	76
Iron	593	143	24.1%	817	73
Juab	132	13	9.8%	169	78
Kane	48	20	41.7%	83	58
Millard	136	35	25.7%	192	71
Morgan	71	31	43.7%	125	57
Piute	0	0	0.0%	18	0
Rich	7	4	57.1%	33	21
Salt Lake	6,176	1,407	22.8%	18,467	33
San Juan	94	2	2.1%	199	47
Sanpete	268	55	20.5%	374	72
Sevier	349	93	26.6%	313	112
Summit	420	39	9.3%	588	71
Tooele	237	53	22.4%	1,084	22
Uintah	186	22	11.8%	486	38
Utah	4,117	788	19.1%	11,109	37
Wasatch	180	43	23.9%	412	44
Washington	1,062	206	19.4%	2,171	49
Wayne	27	0	0.0%	33	82
Weber	2,170	355	16.4%	3,991	54
Totals	20,583	4,110		50,247	

<sup>\*</sup>Child Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

Available spaces are the number of spaces a regulated provider is actually willing to take.

TABLE 5
2006 Child Care Needs Assessment
4 and 5 Year Olds

		Spaces Vacant			Child Care
	Available Spaces	•		Child	Density
	for	for	Percent	Population	Ratio*
County	4 and 5	4 and 5	Spaces Vacant	4 and 5 Year	
, and the second second	Year Olds	Year Olds	or Not Used	Olds	2006
Beaver	50	8	16.0%	225	22
Box Elder	550	73	13.3%	1,565	35
Cache	997	243	24.4%	4,440	22
Carbon	170	29	17.1%	527	32
Daggett	0	0	0.0%	25	0
Davis	2,363	401	17.0%	10,498	23
Duchesne	139	27	19.4%	561	25
Emery	71	23	32.4%	308	23
Garfield	40	0	0.0%	135	30
Grand	79	16	20.3%	238	33
Iron	592	144	24.3%	1,630	36
Juab	132	13	9.8%	352	38
Kane	48	20	41.7%	159	30
Millard	136	35	25.7%	403	34
Morgan	76	31	40.8%	243	31
Piute	0	0	0.0%	38	0
Rich	7	4	57.1%	43	16
Salt Lake	6,715	1,637	24.4%	36,390	18
San Juan	78	2	2.6%	455	17
Sanpete	268	55	20.5%	831	32
Sevier	349	96	27.5%	656	53
Summit	461	42	9.1%	1,131	41
Tooele	247	53	21.5%	2,171	11
Uintah	186	22	11.8%	913	20
Utah	4,118	786	19.1%	21,623	19
Wasatch	180	43	23.9%	788	23
Washington	1,072	207	19.3%	4,079	26
Wayne	27	0	0.0%	83	33
Weber	2,225	360	16.2%	7,883	28
Totals	21,376	4,370		98,393	

<sup>\*</sup>Child Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

Available spaces are the number of spaces a regulated provider is actually willing to take.

TABLE 6 2006 Child Care Needs Assessment Kindergarten

		Spaces Vacant			Child Care
	Available Spaces	or Not Used			Density
	for	for	Percent	Child	Ratio*
County	Kindergarten	Kindergarten	Spaces Vacant	Population	
			or Not Used	6 Years Old	2006
Beaver	50	8	16.0%	120	42
Box Elder	691	91	13.2%	784	88
Cache	1,050	316	30.1%	2,135	49
Carbon	238	29	12.2%	283	84
Daggett	0	0	0.0%	14	0
Davis	2,128	280	13.2%	5,092	42
Duchesne	209	27	12.9%	270	77
Emery	71	23	32.4%	145	49
Garfield	40	0	0.0%	62	65
Grand	77	16	20.8%	115	67
Iron	547	143	26.1%	810	68
Juab	132	13	9.8%	170	78
Kane	48	20	41.7%	83	58
Millard	128	35	27.3%	198	65
Morgan	71	25	35.2%	106	67
Piute	0	0	0.0%	25	0
Rich	7	4	57.1%	23	30
Salt Lake	7,344	1,603	21.8%	17,500	42
San Juan	78	2	2.6%	245	32
Sanpete	268	50	18.7%	410	65
Sevier	349	88	25.2%	311	112
Summit	430	39	9.1%	534	81
Tooele	264	52	19.7%	1,072	25
Uintah	314	25	8.0%	419	75
Utah	3,977	741	18.6%	10,281	39
Wasatch	441	40	9.1%	370	119
Washington	1,047	197	18.8%	1,998	52
Wayne	27	0	0.0%	48	56
Weber	1,997	259	13.0%	3,834	52
Totals	22,023	4,126		47,457	

<sup>\*</sup>Child Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

Available spaces are the number of spaces a regulated provider is actually willing to take.

TABLE 7 2006 Child Care Needs Assessment 1st through 6th Grade

		Spaces Vacant			Child Care
	Available Spaces			Child	Density
	for	for	Percent	Population	Ratio*
County	1 through 6	1 through 6	Spaces Vacant	7 to 12	I
	Grade	Grade	or Not Used	Years Old	2006
Beaver	50	8	16.0%	643	8
Box Elder	629	85	13.5%	4,728	13
Cache	1,409	447	31.7%	10,117	14
Carbon	263	29	11.0%	1,529	17
Daggett	0	0	0.0%	83	0
Davis	2,541	246	9.7%	29,328	9
Duchesne	201	27	13.4%	1,523	13
Emery	71	23	32.4%	953	7
Garfield	40	0	0.0%	469	9
Grand	77	16	20.8%	696	11
Iron	547	142	26.0%	3,936	14
Juab	132	13	9.8%	1,080	12
Kane	48	20	41.7%	492	10
Millard	128	35	27.3%	1,326	10
Morgan	61	25	41.0%	817	7
Piute	0	0	0.0%	136	0
Rich	7	4	57.1%	194	4
Salt Lake	7,411	1,635	22.1%	93,339	8
San Juan	78	2	2.6%	1,626	5
Sanpete	223	26	11.7%	2,839	8
Sevier	349	88	25.2%	1,901	18
Summit	356	39	11.0%	3,169	11
Tooele	270	52	19.3%	5,978	5
Uintah	442	35	7.9%	2,443	18
Utah	3,847	711	18.5%	49,768	8
Wasatch	168	40	23.8%	2,056	8
Washington	1,019	181	17.8%	11,063	9
Wayne	27	0	0.0%	269	10
Weber	2,570	261	10.2%	20,828	12
Totals	22,964	4,190		253,329	

<sup>\*</sup>Child Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

Available spaces are the number of spaces a regulated provider is actually willing to take.

TABLE 8 2006 Child Care Needs Assessment Child Population

County	13 year Olds	14 year Olds	15 year Olds	16 year Olds	17 year Olds
Beaver	114	115	111	113	111
Box Elder	836	800	870	877	862
Cache	1,445	1,454	1,496	1,475	1,475
Carbon	253	284	288	298	273
Daggett	13	12	8	8	11
Davis	4,752	4,765	4,816	4,889	4,914
Duchesne	297	295	265	268	310
Emery	168	214	208	209	204
Garfield	63	80	88	73	83
Grand	119	120	125	128	128
Iron	631	610	614	622	626
Juab	174	188	183	183	159
Kane	84	95	100	108	108
Millard	255	258	270	249	291
Morgan	148	154	173	177	164
Piute	18	24	16	24	25
Rich	31	34	37	47	45
Salt Lake	14,743	14,653	14,862	14,837	14,650
San Juan	307	325	322	339	333
Sanpete	416	441	438	404	424
Sevier	315	338	352	358	337
Summit	547	563	591	618	617
Tooele	900	892	834	844	796
Uintah	436	442	476	471	489
Utah	7,297	7,355	7,358	7,160	7,023
Wasatch	353	340	357	340	352
Washington	1,822	1,873	1,955	1,993	1,971
Wayne	47	45	37	46	37
Weber	3,268	3,289	3,330	3,391	3,298
Totals	39,852	40,058	40,580	40,549	40,116

TABLE 9
2006 CHILD Care Needs Assessment
Child Care Resource and Referral (CCR&R) Agencies Serving Utah

Agency	Contact Agent	Counties Served
CCR&R Bridgerland	Utah State University	Box Elder, Cache, and Rich
CCR&R Eastern	College of Eastern Utah	Carbon, Daggett, Duchesne, Emery, Grand San Juan, and Uintah
CCR&R Metro	Children's Services Society of Utah	Salt Lake and Tooele
CCR&R Mountainland	Utah Valley State College	Utah, Summit and Weber
CCR&R Northern	Weber State University	Davis, Morgan and Weber
CCR&R Western	Five County Association of Governments	Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Juab, Kane, Millard Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, Washington, and Wayne

TABLE 10
2006 Child Care Needs Assessment
0 Through 11 Months Old
Child Care Density Ratio\*

-	Child Care Density Ratio					
County	2004	2005	2006			
Beaver	14	13	11			
Box Elder	13	14	16			
Cache	11	9	9			
Carbon	18	14	14			
Daggett	0	0	0			
Davis	10	9	9			
Duchesne	16	14	14			
Emery	11	6	7			
Garfield	9	9	15			
Grand	16	14	18			
Iron	16	24	26			
Juab	24	19	20			
Kane	9	11	17			
Millard	10	12	17			
Morgan	8	12	13			
Piute	6	3	0			
Rich	0	0	6			
Salt Lake	6	7	9			
San Juan	10	13	12			
Sanpete	14	14	15			
Sevier	30	30	23			
Summit	10	20	13			
Tooele	4	4	4			
Uintah	10	8	8			
Utah	5	6	7			
Wasatch	9	12	12			
Washington	15	11	9			
Wayne	41	42	22			
Weber	12	11	12			

 $<sup>^{\</sup>star}\text{Child}$  Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

TABLE 11
2006 Child Care Needs Assessment
12 Through 23 Months Old
Child Care Density Ratio\*

	Office Beristy Ratio			
County	2004	2005	2006	
Beaver	16	15	22	
Box Elder	17	17	16	
Cache	14	10	10	
Carbon	14	16	15	
Daggett		0	0	
Davis	11	10	10	
Duchesne	16	10	13	
Emery	15	9	8	
Garfield	7	9	15	
Grand	16	12	17	
Iron	15	24	26	
Juab	21	19	20	
Kane	11	9	15	
Millard	10	11	16	
Morgan	12	12	13	
Piute	13	3	0	
Rich		0	6	
Salt Lake	8	8	10	
San Juan	10	14	13	
Sanpete	15	17	17	
Sevier	40	33	24	
Summit	15	21	16	
Tooele	6	5	5	
Uintah	5	9	8	
Utah	6	7	7	
Wasatch	10	13	13	
Washington	14	12	10	
Wayne	46	48	23	
Weber	13	12 14		
<u> </u>				

 $<sup>^{\</sup>star}\text{Child}$  Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

TABLE 12 2006 Child Care Needs Assessment 2 Year Olds Child Care Density Ratio\*

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
County	2004	2005	2006	
Beaver	52	54	38	
Box Elder	61	58	68	
Cache	48	34	38	
Carbon	95	59	52	
Daggett	100	64	0	
Davis	46	38	37	
Duchesne	82	65	52	
Emery	51	43	46	
Garfield	28	31	27	
Grand	66	50	87	
Iron	68	66	71	
Juab	75	77	78	
Kane	31	31	61	
Millard	34	49	73	
Morgan	31	55	53	
Piute	35	10	0	
Rich	0	0	19	
Salt Lake	23	25	30	
San Juan	50	43	44	
Sanpete	60	64	65	
Sevier	113	133	97	
Summit	29	102	66	
Tooele	16	16	20	
Uintah	53	42	37	
Utah	18	36	36	
Wasatch	27	44	41	
Washington	65	51	44	
Wayne	136	139	71	
Weber	48	43	48	
I				

<sup>\*</sup>Child Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

TABLE 13 2006 Child Care Needs Assessment 3 Year Olds Child Care Density Ratio\*

County	2004	2005	2006
Beaver	64	56	44
Box Elder	63	65	69
Cache	60	40	42
Carbon	78	71	61
Daggett	156	50	0
Davis	47	42	41
Duchesne	69	64	45
Emery	86	49	46
Garfield	23	36	63
Grand	50	55	76
Iron	97	64	73
Juab	73	80	78
Kane	49	36	58
Millard	47	55	71
Morgan	51	46	57
Piute	25	8	0
Rich		0	21
Salt Lake	29	31	33
San Juan	38	40	47
Sanpete	65	63	72
Sevier	137	123	112
Summit	43	105	71
Tooele	23	18	22
Uintah	58	44	38
Utah	22	36	37
Wasatch	24	51	44
Washington	67	57	49
Wayne	194	156	82
Weber	56	51	54
I		•	

 $<sup>^{\</sup>star}\text{Child}$  Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

TABLE 14
2006 Child Care Needs Assessment
4 and 5 Year Olds
Child Care Density Ratio\*

	orma care periority riams			
County	2004	2005	2006	
Beaver	30	27	22	
Box Elder	35	31	35	
Cache	32	22	22	
Carbon	33	33	32	
Daggett	50	27	0	
Davis	26	22	23	
Duchesne	41	34	25	
Emery	35	24	23	
Garfield	16	16	30	
Grand	27	27	33	
Iron	48	33	36	
Juab	39	38	38	
Kane	18	17	30	
Millard	19	27	34	
Morgan	18	30	31	
Piute	18	4	0	
Rich		0	16	
Salt Lake	16	18	18	
San Juan	13	15	17	
Sanpete	31	32	325	
Sevier	64	68	53	
Summit	19	56	41	
Tooele	11	10	11	
Uintah	27	23	20	
Utah	11	20	19	
Wasatch	14	26	23	
Washington	35	29	26	
Wayne	69	68	33	
Weber	28	27	28	

 $<sup>^{\</sup>star}\text{Child}$  Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

TABLE 15 2006 Child Care Needs Assessment Kindergarten Child Care Density Ratio\*

		<u> </u>		
County	2004	2005	2006	
Beaver	80	52	42	
Box Elder	73	71	88	
Cache	66	47	49	
Carbon	58	65	84	
Daggett	636	238	0	
Davis	42	41	42	
Duchesne	187	113	77	
Emery	65	41	49	
Garfield	37	26	65	
Grand	84	50	67	
Iron	82	72	68	
Juab	96	73	78	
Kane	35	24	58	
Millard	33	48	65	
Morgan	38	46	67	
Piute	21	8	0	
Rich		0	30	
Salt Lake	38	42	42	
San Juan	28	32	32	
Sanpete	68	66	65	
Sevier	119	130	112	
Summit	35	110	81	
Tooele	24	21	25	
Uintah	168	129	75	
Utah	22	44	39	
Wasatch	26	90	119	
Washington	80	57	52	
Wayne	116	145	56	
Weber	50	51	52	

 $<sup>^{\</sup>star}\text{Child}$  Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

TABLE 16 2006 Child Care Needs Assessment 1st Through 6th Grade Child Care Density Ratio\*

County	2003	2004	2005	2006
Beaver	2	10	10	8
Box Elder	6	10	10	13
Cache	7	15	13	14
Carbon	4	19	15	17
Daggett	5	131	80	0
Davis	4	7	7	9
Duchesne	3	27	23	13
Emery	0	9	7	7
Garfield	1	5	5	9
Grand	3	8	7	11
Iron	8	14	13	14
Juab	4	13	12	12
Kane	0	5	4	10
Millard	3	5	7	10
Morgan	2	5	6	7
Piute	24	6	1	0
Rich	0	0	0	4
Salt Lake	5	6	7	8
San Juan	1	4	5	5
Sanpete	3	9	11	8
Sevier	5	21	21	18
Summit	2	5	15	11
Tooele	3	5	4	5
Uintah	2	26	21	18
Utah	1	4	8	8
Wasatch	1	3	8	8
Washington	6	12	11	9
Wayne	8	24	22	10
Weber	6	8	10	12
	-	-	-	
	!			

 $<sup>^{\</sup>star}\text{Child}$  Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

<sup>2003</sup> Only available in this age breakout